### 1NC: Implementation

#### A. Interpretation: Oxford Dictionary defines ban:

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\_english/ban

Officially or legally prohibit:

#### So the aff must defend the implementation of a policy that bans private ownership of handguns. Official is equivalent to legal since the government is the only official authority in the US.

#### B. Violation: they don’t defend implementation of a policy.

#### C. Standards:

#### Precision –

#### top result on oxford dictionary which proves this is how words are actually defined.

#### the OED is constantly updated and since meaning and language are constantly being changed my source most accurately captures their meaning.

Textual accuracy is key:

A) key to jurisdiction-you can’t vote on non-topical affs since you have to vote for the better debater in the context of the res-I’m the only one left with an advocacy

B) pragmatic offense justifies changing the topic or it being bad that the topic is this one, not your counter interp. The topicality rule comes first.

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

2. Ground –

#### Gun bans are policies, not a philosophical theory, so it has to considered by what the policy would look like, imagining the world under that policy. There is literally no way to debate it in the abstract since it assumes real-world constructs like governments, guns, the constitution etc, that’s a pre-req to literally all your offense

#### they exclude all arguments about why gun control could lead to bad consequences like the creation of an black market, politics disads, or how it causes more innocent deaths. this is straight up ALL of the topic lit.

Kopel 95 – david b., Copyright © 1995 Quarterly Journal of Ideology; . Originally published as 18 Qty. J of Ideology 3-34.

In the United States, serious discussion of gun control has taken two primary approaches: the criminological and the legal. Criminologists have asked whether various gun controls would reduce gun crime and other gun misuse, or whether restrictive gun control laws would deprive innocent victims of an efficacious means of self-defense. Legal scholars of gun control have studied whether the right to arms guarantees in the federal constitution and most state constitutions pose legal barriers to restrictions or gun confiscation. This essay has an entirely different purpose: to examine the ideological frameworks of the American gun control debate. The criminological and legal approaches tend to evaluate guns realistically. That is, they look at the benefits and harms (and the legal response thereto) of persons possessing objects which can send a lead bullet downrange. It is clearly true that much of the importance of firearms (for good or ill) depends on their physical characteristics. In this regard, the gun in America is properly understood from the position of realism, in that the most important feature of the gun is its actual physical characteristics: because a gun can shoot a lead projectile at an attacker from a distance, a smaller person can effectively defend herself against an attacker. If the gun is easily portable (as is a handgun), the gun provides an ability to project force (and thereby protect oneself) matched by no other physical object (Snyder, 1993). Conversely, in the hands of some criminals (such as an undersized 15-year-old), the gun also offers an ability to project force that no other object offers.(p.4)

#### no constitution nc – a violation would only occur if they defended a policy change since thinking about passing gun bans doesn’t violate the constitution. That kills legal education about how the aff would function in the real world and also a core neg generic that checks against infinite aff prep.

Ground is key to fairness-we both need arguments to win. Topic lit’s a reason to reject their interp-it removes core education about how the res works.

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses-if the round is skewed towards once debater you can longer test debate skill. 2. Education is a voter since it’s the end goal of debate and provides portable skills-also why schools fund debate in the first place. 3. Jurisdiction is a voter since if the aff isn’t topical it’s out of your jurisdiction to vote on it and you should default neg as I’m the only one with an advocacy. This also implies you evaluate T before theory since jurisdiction is the most important voter.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. I had to spend time reading T to check back abuse-dropping the arg means a portion of my 1nc is moot which kills fairness and education.

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline. Competing interps maximizes fairness and education by fostering good norms for the activity. 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps-also means your arguments are infinitely regressive since reasons why reasonability is itself reasonable are circular and illogical.

No RVIs: 1. Illogical- being fair doesn’t mean you should win- otherwise both debaters would win without theory, which would be irresolvable- comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Topical clash- once theory is initiated we never go back to substance because its unnecessary so no one engages in the topic.

Unfairness denies effective dialogue on kritikal issues which turns your impacts.

Galloway 7 Ryan Galloway, Samford Comm prof, Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, Vol. 28, 2007

Debate as a dialogue sets an argumentative table, where all parties receive a relatively fair opportunity to voice their position. Anything that fails to allow participants to have their position articulated denies one side of the argumentative table a fair hearing. The affirmative side is set by the topic and fairness requirements. While affirmative teams have recently resisted affirming the topic, in fact, the topic selection process is rigorous, taking the relative ground of each topic as its central point of departure. Setting the affirmative reciprocally sets the negative. The negative crafts approaches to the topic consistent with affirmative demands. The negative crafts disadvantages, counter-plans, and critical arguments premised on the arguments that the topic allows for the affirmative team. According to fairness norms, each side sits at a relatively balanced argumentative table. When one side takes more than its share, competitive equity suffers. However, it also undermines the respect due to the other involved in the dialogue. When one side excludes the other, it fundamentally denies the personhood of the other participant (Ehninger, 1970, p. 110). A pedagogy of debate as dialogue takes this respect as a fundamental component. A desire to be fair is a fundamental condition of a dialogue that takes the form of a demand for equality of voice. Far from being a banal request for links to a disadvantage, fairness is a demand for respect, a demand to be heard, a demand that a voice backed by literally months upon months of preparation, research, and critical thinking not be silenced. Affirmative cases that suspend basic fairness norms operate to exclude particular negative strategies. Unprepared, one side comes to the argumentative table unable to meaningfully participate in a dialogue. They are unable to “understand what ‘went on…’” and are left to the whims of time and power (Farrell, 1985, p. 114).

Outweighs your offense: A. probability-theory norms are set all the time since arguments go in and out of the meta but nobody ever stops oppression with one position, B. the judge has to indicate who won the round, fairness best coheres with this since if one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the *truth value* of the K so cross-applications don’t work.

### K

#### The aff’s focus on a hypothetical world in which nobody owns guns ignores the mass incarceration and status quo racist enforcement. Increasingly strict gun policies are inseparable from increased police power.

Willick 15. JASON WILLICK. (Staff Writer, The American Interest), 10-2-2015, "Gun Control: More Racial Disparities Than the Drug War," American Interest, http://www.the-american-interest.com/2015/10/02/gun-control-more-racial-disparities-than-the-drug-war/, accessed 2-4-2016. NP.

Original ideas and measured arguments are hard to come by in the wake of mass shootings, like the one that occurred yesterday at a community college in Oregon. Emotions are running high, and liberal pundits are screaming at conservative pundits with an unusual level of venom about how they have blood on their hands for opposing new gun control laws. Conservatives, on the defensive, counter that the left is “politicizing tragedy,” or else recycle arguments that mass shootings can only be prevented by an even more well-armed populace. One exception last night came from Michael Dougherty, a columnist for The Week, who noted incisively that “the horror at gun violence and the horror at war on crime criminal justice policy are in deep tension.” Dougherty is right: Many liberals who believe adamantly in strict gun control laws believe just as adamantly that the legacy of tough-on-crime conservatism is responsible for the horrors of mass incarceration, and all the racial baggage it carries with it. Many gun control advocates seem to be under the impression that governments can pass new felony legislation that will take guns off the streets without requiring more aggressive policing, without putting more people in prison, and without the racial disparities in enforcement that characterize the rest of our criminal justice system. This is a fantasy: Gun control and tough-on-crime politics are two sides of the same coin. If governments are serious about cracking down on illegal guns in a meaningful way, they will need to use all of the same tools that they used to crack down on crime from the 1970s onward—tough criminal penalties (i.e., long prison sentences for offenders) and aggressive policing, especially in poor and minority neighborhoods that tend to have the highest rates of crime. Indeed, as Reason‘s A. Barton Hinkle pointed out, New York’s notorious stop-and-frisk policies, which left-wing mayor Bill DeBlasio led the charge against, was arguably one of the most effective gun control policies in the country. Moreover, all the evidence suggests that stricter gun laws would fall disproportionately on the same people who have always bear the brunt of tough criminal justice policies. The Washington Post‘s Radley Balko noted last year that “47.3 percent of those convicted for federal gun crimes were black — a racial disparity larger than any other class of federal crimes, including drug crimes.” According to the Bureau of Labor of Justice statistics, state, local, and federal governments arrested black people for gun crimes at a five times higher rate than they arrested whites. More than three out of four gun arrests were in urban areas. So people who empathize with the message of the Black Lives Matter movement—that young, black men in America’s cities are treated unfairly by the criminal justice system and that mass incarceration has devastated too many communities—should think further about what the draconian gun policies they pine for would actually entail. Most socially liberal gun control champions don’t see themselves as pushing policies that would abet racial profiling or worsen the problem of mass incarceration. They see themselves as going after their political enemies—socially conservative white men in red states. And it may in fact be possible to craft narrow gun policies—like requiring more background checks at gun shows—that would mostly affect people in this demographic. But few intelligent observers are under any illusions that this type of symbolic half-measure on gun control would meaningfully cut into America’s gun violence statistics. Meaningfully reducing gun violence in a nation with 300 million guns would probably require the type of confiscatory gun regulations enacted in Australia and some European countries. And the mechanics of enacting such policies could well contradict the vision for police and prison reform that has been gaining momentum on the left and right alike over the past year.

#### Disengaging with reality is a way to preserve racism and oppression—imaging a world without guns is whitewashes over racism and pretends it doesn't exist. This preserves existing oppression and is counter-productive.

Curry 13. Dr. Tommy J. Curry 13, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Texas A&M, "In the Fiat of Dreams: The Delusional Allure of Hope, the Reality of Anti-Black Violence and the Demands of the Anti-Ethical", 2013.

Despite the rhetorical strategies adopted by both Black and white political theorists which urge Blacks and whites alike to demand Americans to continue their allegiance to the foundational de-racialized ethos of the post-Civil Rights era, the reality of the American racism—its sheer recurring violence against Black people—demands more than symbolic rhetorical allusion. To seriously grasp the reality of racist oppression and the sempiternal machinations of anti-Blackness throughout American society be it in its institutions like the prison industrial complex, its policies like Affirmative action, or its manipulation of Black social degradation and economic disadvantage to support pathological theses about disasters like Katrina or cultural deviance as in the death of Trayvon Martin, Darius Simmons, or Jordan Davis, the study of the matter itself—racism—must be a study of a conceptual disengagement with the myth of racial equality and the “automatic progressivism” of the American liberal project. This disengagement is not simply the refusal to accept the idealism of civil rights myth held beyond the realm of fact, but the disengagement with the illusions of democracy and equality that continue to ignore the role that violence has played and continues to play in the subjugation, incarceration, and vilification of Black life. As Dr. A.J. William Myers reveals in his work groundbreaking work entitled Destructive Impulses, Until at such time white America (and Black America) is openly willing to confront a historical legacy of its own violence (perpetrated against an American people of color), any venture into and/ or expository on race relations becomes an exercise in futility…As a result, therefore, white violence, confined to the subliminal recesses of the American psyche, continues to prevent the transition necessary for the country to move beyond the idea of race. In America, Blackness and the racism that continues to condemn those historical racialized peoples is violence—it is the forceful and coercion enclosing of human beings to an inferior social, political, and economic status of which their own humanity exceeds. This dehumanizing relegation of the raced citizen is not a gradual or incremental debasement, but rather the historically immediate condition of inferiority that presents progress to be attainable by the cyclical degrees of physical violence against the racialized population. For these racially oppressed peoples, violence is the permanent fixture of existence in America, since it is the vitiation of their humanity that rationalizes the varying techniques of their cultural erasure, birthing the emergent symbolic associations of degradation that replace their invisibility, and empowering the intentional enforcements of their societal exclusions. In fact, it is precisely this triumvirate that gauges what we take to be the negation of the necessity of revolutionary change--since the raced is taken to be present, as a result of a critical redefining of humanity, integrated into society. The potentiality of whiteness—the proleptic call of white anti-racist consciousness— is nothing more than the fiat of an ahistorical dream. A command ushered before thought engages racism, before awareness of the world becomes aware of what is actual. This is forced upon accounts of racism where whiteness is morally obscured from being seen as is. [w]hiteness as is partly determined by what could be, since what is was a past potentiality—a could be. The appeal to the sentimentality, morality, the moral abstraction/distraction of equality—both as a political command and its anthropological requisite—complicate the most obvious consequence of anti-Black racism, namely violence. This moral apriorism urges the Black thinker to conceptualize racism as an activist project rooted in the potential of a world filled with non-racists, a world where the white racist is transformed by Black activity into the white anti-racist. But this project supposes an erroneous view of the white racist which occludes the reality of white supremacy and anti-Black racism. As Robert F. Williams argues in Negroes with Guns, “the racist is a man crazed by hysteria at the idea of coming into equal contact with Negroes. And this mass mental illness called racism is very much a part of the ‘American way of Life.’” The white racist is not seen as the delusional individual ostracized from society as a result of their abhorrent social pathologies of racist hate. Rather the white racist is normal—the extended family, the spouse, the sibling, the friend of the white individual—the very same entities upon which the inter/intrasubjectivity nexus of the white self is founded. The white [he] experiences no punishment for his longing for Black servitude and his need to exploit and divest the Black worker here and then of [his] wealth. The white [she] has no uneasiness about her raping of—the destruction of generations of Black selves—mothers, children, and men—and today usurps the historical imagery of “the nigger,” to politically vacate Blackness and demonize niggers as beyond political consideration. She rewrites history, pens morality, and embodies the post-racial civil rights subject. As such, racism, the milieu of the white racist is not the exposed pathological existence of the white race, but rather valorized in white individuality, the individuality that conceptualizes their racism as a normative aspiration of what the world should look like, and even more damning, an aspiration that can be supported and propagated in the world. The white racist recognizes the deliberateness of the structures, relations, and systems in a white supremacist society and seeks like their colonial foreparents to claim them as their own. Traditionally we have taken ethics to be, as Henry Sidgwick’s claims, "any rational procedure by which we determine what individual human beings 'ought'—or what is right for them—or to seek to realize by voluntary action.” This rational procedure is however at odds with the empirical reality the ethical deliberation must concern itself with. To argue, as is often done, that the government, its citizens, or white people should act justly, assumes that the possibility of how they could act defines their moral disposition. If a white person could possibly not be racist, it does not mean that the possibility of not being racist, can be taken to mean that they are not racist. In ethical deliberations dealing with the problem of racism, it is common practice to attribute to historically racist institutions, and individuals universal moral qualities that have yet to be demonstrated. This abstraction from reality is what frames our ethical norms and allows us to maintain, despite history or evidence, that racist entities will act justly given the choice. Under such complexities, the only ethical deliberation concerning racism must be anti-ethical, or a judgment refusing to write morality onto immoral entities

#### The alternative is less sensationalist approaches to gun control. Criticizing gun ownership without criticizing the state normalizes violence and oppression.

Spade 13. Dean Spade, Brooklyn College, 2-7-2013, "Gun Control, Surveillance and Trans Resistance," No Publication, http://srlp.org/gun-control-surveillance-and-trans-resistance/, accessed 2-6-2016. NP 2/6/16.

In the wake of the Newtown shooting, the issue of gun control is being framed in very selective ways that ignore the realities of violence in our communities. The truth is that the most deadly, in terms of numbers, gun owners are police forces and the US military. When we have a conversation about gun violence that ignores the realities of state violence, it often produces proposals that further marginalize and criminalize people of color, poor people, people with disabilities, immigrants and youth. In Washington State, we’re fighting against a new bill that would create mandatory jail time for youth caught possessing a gun. We know that mandatory jail and prison sentences are part of what has created the massive boom in US imprisonment in recent decades that have devastated communities of color.

xxx

We know that jailing youth does not make our communities safer, it just damages the lives, health outcomes, and educational opportunities of young people. As our country continues this debate about gun control, I hope that we can bring a recognition of the massive violence of criminalization and militarization to this discussion, and that we can think about safety in less sensationalist and more realistic ways. For trans communities, whose daily experiences of pathologization, violence and surveillance inform our understandings of the world, the reform proposals emerging after Newtown are of great concern.

## Case

### turns

#### T - Totalizing assumptions of the other alienate them and prevent them from being included within our moral view

**Beavers 95,** Anthony F., Introducing Levinas to Undergraduate Philosophers, 1995. NP

If we can accept this notion that ideas are inventions of the mind, that ideas are, when it comes down to it, only interpretations of something, and if ethics, in fact, is taken to refer[s] to real other persons who exist apart from my interpretations, then we are up against a problem: there is no way in which ideas, on the current model, [do not] refer to independently existing other persons, [thus] and as such, ideas cannot be used to found an ethics. There can be no pure practical reason until after contact with the other is established. Given this view towards ideas, then, anytime I take the person in my idea to be the real person, I have closed off contact with the real person; I have cut off the connection with the other that is necessary if ethics is to refer to real other people. This is a central violence to the other that denies the other his/her own autonomy. Levinas calls this violence "totalization" and it occurs whenever I limit the other to a set of rational categories, be they racial, sexual, or otherwise. Indeed, it occurs whenever I already know what the other is about before the other has spoken. Totalization is a denial of the other's difference, the denial of the otherness of the other. That is, it is the inscription of the other in the same. If ethics presupposes the real other person, then such totalization will, in itself, be unethical.

Handgun bans are inherently totalizing. A ban is by definition an absolutist rule and breeds totalization since it presumes only one role for gun ownership, and ignores particularities of individual needs. This outweighs – a. it precludes interactions between individuals – if we can not conceptualize the reality of the other, they are considered alien, b. epistemic prerequisite – if you can not conceptualize the other, you can not include them in your community

#### T- mandatory frameworks inhibit a sense of responsibility for other members of society

Mansell, Samuel. Proximity and Rationalisation: Reflections on the Limits of a Levinasian Ethics in the context of Corporate Governance. https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/management/documents/research/research-units/cppe/conference-pdfs/levinas/mansell.pdf

The more flexible a set of rules can be, such as the voluntary codes and principles used by business, the more chance will exist for aligning these **r**ules with a sense of responsibility for the Other. This requirement for flexibility is explained by Levinas’s argument that our responsibility for the Other can never be set along one fixed dimension. So, paradoxically perhaps, whilst the sort of ethical codes used by business can serve as an escape from real responsibility, they can at the same time (through their flexible and voluntary nature) offer the possibility for a degree of alignment with responsibility that a mandatory framework cannot capture. Directors have, under the UK Combined Code of 2003 (which I mention only as an example) the choice to comply with the principles in the code, or explain why they have deviated from them. Likewise, an employee who is supposedly subject to the ‘ethical code’ of the business will almost always have room for a flexible interpretation of what this means in any given context, and be able to apply what Aristotle (1980) calls ‘practical wisdom’. There is a chance that in the space left open by this flexibility, principles can be adhered to that do reflect a genuine openness of responsibility.

This outweighs – a. ability to recognize responsibility for others is an individual obligation, not the state’s since the community exists between individuals. B. it’s intrinsic to the maxim of the aff - there’s no room to choice whether or not to carry handguns – your intention arguments are solely about mindset, which is contingent, and not an intention since it’s a question of what is a part of the structure of a given maxim. C. Longevity – it establishes a culture of responsibility that does not have to be enforced by the state.